

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID NATHANIEL ROBERTS,
Plaintiff,

v.
CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON
SACRAMENTO,
Defendant.

No. 2:20-CV-1068-TLN-DMC-P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the Court is plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel (ECF No. 4).

The United States Supreme Court has ruled that district courts lack authority to require counsel to represent indigent prisoners in § 1983 cases. See Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In certain exceptional circumstances, the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). See Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). A finding of "exceptional circumstances" requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims on his own in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. See Terrell, 935 F.2d at 1017. Neither factor is

1 dispositive and both must be viewed together before reaching a decision. See id. In Terrell, the
2 Ninth Circuit concluded the district court did not abuse its discretion with respect to appointment
3 of counsel because:

4 . . . Terrell demonstrated sufficient writing ability and legal knowledge to
5 articulate his claim. The facts he alleged and the issues he raised were not
6 of substantial complexity. The compelling evidence against Terrell made
it extremely unlikely that he would succeed on the merits.

7 Id. at 1017.

8 In the present case, the Court does not at this time find the required exceptional
9 circumstances. Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel is simply a boilerplate power of attorney
10 form which seeks to appoint the Court as plaintiff's attorney. See ECF No. 4. Plaintiff does not
11 present facts which articulate "exceptional circumstances" justifying court appointment of
12 counsel at this time.

13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's request for the
14 appointment of counsel (ECF No. 4) is denied.

15
16 Dated: June 15, 2020



17
18 DENNIS M. COTA
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28